UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The University of Chicago States Its Case

Harold H. Swift
Robert M. Hutchins
Charles E. Merriam

Senator Long, Father Coughlin, Dr. Townsend

By John Haynes Holmes

Senate Resolution No. 141

By Senator Tydings of Maryland

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 7

Chicago, June 3, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIALS—

Notes 123
The Hunger Motive—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 125
Jottings—J. H. H 126

ARTICLES—

The University of Chicago States Its Case—HAROLD H. SWIFT, ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, CHARLES E. MERRIAM 127
Senator Long, Father Coughlin, Dr. Townsend: Demagogues or Deliverers!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 131
Senate Resolution No. 141—*Millard E. Tydings* 136

POETRY—

Flags—ROBERT WHITAKER 130
Silver and Gold—MARGARET LATHROP LAW 130

THE STUDY TABLE—

After the Crucifixion—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 137
Two Servants of God—TARAKNATH DAS 137

CORRESPONDENCE—

The World a Madhouse?—WINIFRED B. COSSETTE 138
The World and the Churches—JOHN T. RICKETT 138

THE FIELD—

Sharecroppers Organize—*Harold E. Fey* 122

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Sharecroppers Organize

By Harold E. Fey

"If we're lucky," said Walter Moskop, "we get two dollars a week to keep a family of five. That ain't supposed to cover clothing, too, 'cause we ain't supposed to have none of that."

The speaker was a member of the Marked Tree, Arkansas local of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. He was sitting in the New York office of the League for Industrial Democracy, with Ed Pickering, president of the Post, Arkansas local of the union and E. B. McKinney, Negro vice-president of the union. The trio had come to New York to "call this here New Deal bluff about acreage reduction contracts." Sharecroppers have always had a hard time, McKinney pointed out, "but before that there A. A. A. came along we used to get something; now we get nothing."

"We just want to let the world know what's going on down there; how us fellows are being evicted; how the landlords do us with crooked pencils, and how we get beat up and arrested when we try to say something about it.

"That's why we're up here making speeches and appearing in public," said Moskop. "You can't even be a sharecropper any more. You see, the government came along and said under that there A. A. A. all cotton acreage has got to be reduced 50 per cent. So the plantation owner tells a sharecropper with sixteen acres that he can only have eight acres the next year. Well, the government pays 3½ cents a pound for the cotton put out of acreage and the sharecropper is supposed to get half of that rental money. But we don't get it. So, all we got is half as much land to make a living on. There ain't no day labor for common farm hands any more, and yet most of the sharecroppers are forced into day labor. We have been evicted by hundreds; set out on the road with our stuff. We want help."

The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union insists that hereafter the government shall pay their half of the rental money direct to them, instead of to the land-owner.

Ed Pickering, a white-haired

(*Continued on page* 139)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1935 No. 7

UNITY *is one voice joined in the world-wide chorus of lamentation over the death of Jane Addams, humanitarian and idealist, saint, seer, and statesman. Miss Addams was for a full generation the greatest woman in America, and has passed into immortality as one of the great women of all time.* UNITY *will pay fitting tribute to Miss Addams, who was a life-long reader of this paper and a friend of its editors, in a special issue in memory and in eulogy of her fame, to be published next month.*

President Roosevelt's veto of the Patman Bonus Bill was courage of the highest order. The message which sent the veto like a pistol shot straight at the Congressional bull's eye was a document of ability equal to the high spirit which prompted it. The Bonus proposition is of course an abominable thing. Not that the veterans do not deserve more than they ever got out of the War! Not that we do not relish, as an unregenerate pacifist, the gorgeous spectacle of this war being made expensive to the last drop of the resources of the country which was weak and wicked enough to go into it! But we count it fundamentally inconsistent with any concept of justice, an arrant betrayal of democracy, for any organized group to wring money from the government, through sheer lobby power, on behalf of their own separate and selfish interests. This nation is headed for the rocks when any group for any reason can "hold up" the government and force it to "deliver." But this Patman measure was not only a piece of iniquitous legislation reeking with the worst kind of special privilege, but was also, and dangerously, an inflation bill. In the crassest and crudest way imaginable, it provided that money should be produced by the printing-press method. That the country could stand the distribution of the two billions of paper currency concerned, without any immediate disaster, is certain. But that's not the point! What is important is that this measure proposed to start the presses which, once started, never stop until the flood of worthless money has engulfed and ruined the land. The story of inflation is always the same and could not be escaped here. This the President saw, and with sublime courage declared. At one stroke he defied the veterans and all their hangers-on, ignored the politicians, flaunted Hearst, slapped Father Coughlin in the face, and thus prepared the way for more serious opposition in his presidential campaign this coming year than he has ever encountered before in all his career. All this he must have known—all honor to him! We hope that he also knew that action of this kind is not in vain, and must win in the end that full support of enlightened minds which is alone worth having in this world.

The challenge to mankind in this crisis of the world's affairs is to our mind perfectly simple. Three things must be done, and done quickly, if humanity is to survive in ordered and progressive modes of life. First, and most obviously, we must get rid of war. The time has passed by when we can have any parleying with this iniquity. In the old days war and civilization could exist together in the same society. But no more —*no more!* War is today so universal in its range and so destructive in its impact, that it sweeps everything to ruin. The world can survive in the future only under conditions of peace. Secondly, we must abolish poverty. There was a time when poverty was inevitable, since man had no means of sustaining a production adequate to meet the needs of a growing population. In spite of his best endeavors, he always faced in the end a scarcity, which necessitated in turn a scarcity economy. But now scarcity has been overcome by abundance. The basis of civilization in our time is not deficit but surplus. Which means that there is no reason any longer why any man, or group of men, should be poor! The end of poverty, in other words, is in sight, and must straightway be achieved. Nothing is more significant at this moment than the tidal swing of multitudes to the support of leaders who by methods wise or unwise, promise a sharing among all of the world's wealth. Thirdly, we must preserve democracy, which, being interpreted, means that we must destroy Fascism. The social progress of mankind for a thousand years has been measured by the race's advance toward liberty. Now the principles and institutions of free democracy are threatened by a resurgence of ancient savagery. Before it is too late, we must protect what has been won by such bitter struggle and at such heavy cost, and therewith reinaugurate "the rights of man." This is our three-fold task. Storm Jameson,

in her new book, "Challenge To Death," describes the present crisis accurately:

> There is a vital relationship of war, poverty, and Fascism. If we will war, we will poverty with the same impulse. If we cannot get rid of poverty, with its dead weight of the irresponsible and the repressed, we cannot eliminate war. Fascism exploits and perpetuates both.

To the person who hails the Communist undertaking in Russia as the greatest social experiment in history, and who fears Fascism as a typical reversion to savagery and barbarism, it is appalling to note the similarities in certain respects of the two regimes. Why should there be any similarities at all? Yet here they are! Thus, in Italy are Mediterranean islands, and in Germany interior concentration camps, and in Russia the northern forests and fisheries, to which are sent into exile the miserable beings who have come under condemnation of the government. In Italy, again, there is the suppression of the Communists, and in Germany the suppression of the Communists and the Jews, and in Russia the "liquidation," as it is called, of the Kulaks on the farms and the intelligentsia in the cities—and in all three countries the brutal annihilation of the pacifists. Still again, in Italy the murder of Matteoti and his associates is matched in Germany by the Hitler "purge" of June 30th last, and in Russia by the Stalin massacre following the assassination of Kirov. In Italy, Germany, and Russia alike, in other words—under Fascism, and Naziism, and also under Bolshevism—there exists the rule of tyranny and terror. Does this mean that our reactionary friends are right in their insistence that all these three rules are forms of ancient despotism, and that there is not a hair's line of difference between them? And if not, why should the Russians, whom we believe to be enlightened, deliberately give this excuse to their enemies to denounce and deride them? As a liberal, we find it harder and harder to defend the Communist cause in the face of horrors which belong not to Moscow but to Rome and Berlin. As a friend of Russia, we can think of nothing so important as the complete dissociation of Communist rule from anything and everything savoring of Fascist gangsterism. After eighteen years, are not the Bolshevists strong enough to be humane?

The recent death of Marshal Pilsudski, dictator of Poland, illustrates anew the fact that men do count in this world of practical affairs. Impersonal forces, economic, political, social, explain much, but not everything. What would have happened to Russia, in 1917, if Lenin had not been allowed to pass through Germany to Petrograd, or had died or been killed upon the way? How different would have been the history of America if the assassin's bullet had really found its intended mark in the body of Mr. Roosevelt! And now behold the sudden alteration of the European scene in the passing of one man in a little country of accidently vast importance in the contemporary crisis! Pilsudski was in his way, of course, a Fascist before all Fascists. Hard, cruel, ruthless, nationalistic in the narrowest degree, militaristic to the core, a dictator in every drop of his cold blood, he seized Poland in the days following the early post-war confusion, and held the nation in a grip of iron which death alone could relax. His one hate and fear, of course, was Russia, and his alliance with France was always an anti-Soviet rather than a pro-French relation. When, in these later few years, France was driven by sheer terror of the Nazis into the Bolshevik embrace, Pilsudski naturally and happily veered to Hitler, who was his liege brother in savagery, and also in hostility to Communist Russia. The full extent of the understanding between Germany and Poland, Hitler and Pilsudski, has of course never been revealed, but there can be little doubt that it covered a wide and crucial area. Now, at the very moment when feverish French overtures were being so cooly received by Poland, the Dictator has died—and, presto, the scene is transformed! In these few weeks following the passing of the Polish marshal, the situation has cleared very little, but it is obvious enough that Hitler and the Nazis have been dealt a heavy blow by fate. More than ever the Reich is now internationally isolated. Will this mean sudden moderation of policy, or some move more desperate and daring than ever?

Lawrence of Arabia will be remembered forever as one of the romantic figures of the ages. He was a "character" in the truest and most distinctive sense of the word. His diversity of qualities was not the least element of amaze in his extraordinary personality. That one and the same man should outride the Arabs in the great camel raids of the Near East campaigns of the World War, then hide himself as an obscure flyer in an aeroplane squadron in the English army, only to emerge as the translator of Homer's "Odyssey" in a modern version of incomparable originality and power, is a theme indeed of incredible drama. We suppose that the sanity of the man will always be an occasion of dispute. His career is dotted with exploits, suspicious instances of eccentricity and exhibitionism, which it is difficult to reconcile with reason. Also, there were cruelties in the man's soul, calculated or wild instances of savagery, which seem to have little place in the mind of any sane individual. What is one to say, for example, about certain of the horrors perpetrated by Lawrence in his war against the Turks, horrors related with cold-blooded calmness in his narrative of his own deeds? And what is one to say of his mad dashes about the English countryside at 80 and 100 miles an hour on his motor-cycle, which brought him at last, and inevitably, to his death? But whatever the inner secret of this man, he wrote a chapter of adventure and achievement which posterity will

cherish forever. His battles in the East were of amazing brilliancy—his mastery of the Arab tribesmen, as a mere lad of twenty-seven years, a breath-taking feat. As for his defiance of his king and country, when Britain characteristically refused to make good his pledges to his comrades in arms on the Syrian plains, this was an instance of courage, and sheer idealism which lifts the heart. "Lawrence of Arabia" has already become a legend. When greater men are all forgotten, his name will shine in a strange light of memory.

Less and less can we blame the churches these days for not speaking out on the social question. The conscience of Christianity is awake and active as never before. Witness, for example, the declarations recently proclaimed by the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church! A declaration against war is not so unusual these days, thank heaven, but few declarations are so decisive as this proclaimed by these New York Methodists:

> We encourage our people to renounce war and its causes as sin and, as Christians, to refuse participation in war or war preparations, directly as combatants, or indirectly as munitions workers or investors.

This statement was followed up by a denunciation of "military training of our youth," the advocacy of "conscription of wealth" in wartime, and the demand that the power of the President and the Congress to declare war be transferred "to the people whose will shall be determined by a national plebiscite." After thus handling the abomination of war, these Methodists proceeded to pay their respects to capitalism which, they asserted, "must be discarded and a planned Christian economy established." Unless family incomes in this country of $3,000 to $10,000 were made possible, our present economic system "must declare its intellectual and moral bankruptcy." The New Deal was unmercifully dealt with. The whole policy of the administration had proved itself a failure in "blindly" serving a "system of exploitation" for private profit. The following passages from the report of the Conference on the New Deal speak for themselves:

> The tenderness with which the sacred cow of private profits has been protected, while suffering has been indescribably inhuman, indicts both the intelligence and character of our nation.
>
> * * *
>
> More serious has been the moral inflation which has utilized the vocabulary of social well-being as a smoke-screen to continue monopoly, economic imperialism and vested profiteering amid growing relief and unemployment.

Proposals for social security legislation were endorsed "as beginnings," but the report assailed

> . . . the blindness of the administration toward the fact that our profit system is geared to the exploitation of the workers and the liquidation of the middle classes and professional groups.

Other items in this report of the Methodist Convention condemned "the Tammany-trained tactics" of James A. Farley which "more than neutralize the high-sounding phrases of the White House," called for new efforts to preserve our civil liberties against attack, and censured the employers of the country for fighting the organization of labor. What a document! These Christians may be right or wrong in their opinions, but they certainly have the courage of their idealism.

The Boston Community Church, the largest liberal congregation in America, has elected a Negro as President of the congregation. This gentleman, Mr. William M. Bullock, lawyer, was chosen to this office of leadership, be it said, on his own personal merits. There was no sentimentalism in this business, least of all any pose or pretension. Mr. Bullock through a series of years had proved himself to be a wise counsellor, able administrator, and true friend of the church's interests. He earned his present place of leadership through sheer ability and devotion among his fellows. The fact that he is a Negro was a mere incident which did not affect the issue decisively either one way or the other. But that is just the point! The fact that a man is a Negro *does* affect the issue in such cases, almost invariably in a way unfavorable to the negro's chances of recognition and honor. In the world as at present organized, in this nation as at present dominated, the Negro is simply not allowed to associate on equal terms of manhood with his fellows. The remarkable thing about the action of the Boston Community Church is that this overwhelmingly white congregation refused to conform to this tacit standard of race discrimination. On the contrary, they ignored it, defied it. Here in their good company of members they had found a man of altogether exceptional capacities of leadership and qualities of character. Among them all there was none better fitted to take over the exacting duties of President of the congregation. So naturally, inevitably, happily, they elected him—and he was a Negro! Some day, God grant, an action of this kind will cause no comment and occasion no surprise, for everywhere, as in this great free church of Boston, all men, whites and blacks, Gentiles and Jews, natives and aliens, will stand together on a single level of true manhood. But today this action stands forth conspicuous as a superb vindication of the ideal of brotherhood. We congratulate the church and Mr. Bullock on thus practicing as well as preaching their religion.

The Hunger Motive

Hunger is without doubt a powerful incentive to activity. But it is only an elemental animal urge. Once hunger is appeased activity thus inspired ceases. There is nothing in it on which to build a civilization.

Furthermore, as a drive to activity, it is one of the most dangerous for a civilization to cultivate. When hunger is not appeased there is scarcely any limit of recklessness to which its victims will not resort. Among

animals it is almost the only incentive to that ferocity which is commonly attributed to beasts in the wilds.

The mother instinct, the urge to protect the young, accounts for this apparent ferocity, wherever that instinct is aroused. But the only other major impulse which makes beasts beasts is hunger; probably no animal is naturally and ineradically ferocious.

Noted "camera" hunters in Africa have recently been making much of this. When the hunter invades the lairs of the most savage animals without a weapon, and the animals do not identify him as a slayer, they never attack except as they are driven by hunger. Well-fed lions in their native habitat are as docile as sheep, these explorers assert.

Our civilization has now officially abandoned the hunger motive. It is too crude, and savage, and destructive of all the finer values for which a civilization stands, to be further employed. The same is true of most or all of the European countries. Indeed, the same must be true wherever attempt is made to maintain a highly organized society of the modern type. There is almost no force powerful enough to preserve order in a community which deliberately attempts to employ hunger as a social drive. Hungry people will not remain docile and orderly if there is within reach the means of assuaging their pangs.

Great masses of people will often yield to extreme distress from want, before resorting to that most dehumanizing of all urges, namely, cannibalism. This is illustrated often in China and India, in the event of widespread famine. But where all do not suffer deprivation together, where some affect abundance and the rest starve, there is the making of social chaos, and reversion of the human to the animal in full measure of animal ferocity.

When the streets of Paris ran red with human blood, the mob's cry was "Give us bread; we demand food." There is no more dangerous passion to arouse than that of hunger. Grumble and groan as any may over the mounting appropriations of public money employed in relief, this resistance is foolish, unless somebody has measures to propose which will appease hunger otherwise than through these relief grants.

And there is much such grumbling and groaning. Some who enjoy ease and assumed security are disposed to fall back upon that officially discarded formula, "Let them work if they would eat." Furthermore, much of the relief program is still wedded to that old formula, however ostentatiously it may have been officially discarded. By threats of withdrawing relief doles it tries to drive men into jobs which exist only precariously, if at all.

All this would be the height of folly if it were not the depth of inhumanity. Civilization, in just the degree that it aspires to be civilization, must discard the hunger motive, not merely temper it, not camouflage its abandonment under cover of "charity," not pauperize the population by passing out niggardly doles. The evil thing that it is, this elemental urge to bestiality, must be eradicated from all the councils of a civilized program.

Outcry is raised against alleged scandals of current relief administration; some claim relief doles who do not "deserve" them; some remain upon relief rather than seize precarious jobs alleged to be offered to them. The scandal is the institution itself; incidental breaches of the decorum which it seeks to exact are not worth mentioning.

A civilization which permits the hunger motive to play any part in its social scheme is too slightly removed from animal savagery to be worthy of self-respect. Until this evil thing is altogether eradicated from our social set-up there will, indeed, be scandal enough. But the thing itself is the scandal. Never mistake that.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

Prof. Einstein, who expected and was announced to give an address at the presentation of the Franklin Medal in Philadelphia the other night, did not speak because, as he explained, "he had nothing to say at the moment." Now we know indeed that Prof. Einstein is the greatest man of modern times.

The question of radio advertising is becoming acute. Another year of the sales-talks inflicted upon a not helpless public this past year, and the same fate will befall the radio that befell the movies when the Legion of Decency got to work.

We wonder if there is any significance in the fact that Cain, the first murderer, "became the builder of a city." Oswald Spengler, in his "The Decline of the West," tells us that the big city is always the sign of a decaying civilization. Babylon, Nineveh, Thebes, Tyre, Athens, Rome, they all crumbled and fell, or were destroyed. The curse of Cain was upon them. And modern Rome, Berlin, Paris, London, New York, Tokyo—how is it with them?

Hitler has an ambition to go down in history as the new Charlemagne. It is altogether probable that he will be remembered as the new Attila.

More than the Greeks ever did, the Americans always "have a word for it." This word "rabble-rousing," for example. From all the days of Critias and Catiline to the present days of Coughlin and Huey Long, was there ever a phrase like it for accuracy and vigor?

Names always fascinate us. They are so often so perfectly appropriate! Congressman Gassaway, for example, the loquacious cow-boy of the West, with his riding boots, his ten-gallon hat, his clownish antics, and his unceasing tongue! What could be more perfect than his name—*Gas-away?*

J. H. H.

The University of Chicago States Its Case

The case for the University of Chicago was ably stated before the Hearing in Chicago of the investigating committee of the Illinois Senate inquiring into the charge made by Mr. Charles R. Walgreen of the Walgreen drug stores to the effect that he had removed his niece from the university because of "red" influences on the campus. Following the statement by Mr. Walgreen to the committee, the university was given ample opportunity to state its case. The statements that follow were secured at the hearing and are official.

Statement by Harold H. Swift

My name is Harold H. Swift. I was born in the city of Chicago fifty years ago and have lived on the south side of Chicago all of my life. I am connected with Swift & Company, meat packers, in the capacity of vice-president and director.

I am President of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago. The other members of the Board are:

Sewell L. Avery, President U. S. Gypsum Co., Montgomery Ward & Co.

Charles F. Axelson, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Harrison B. Barnard, Building Contractor.

Laird Bell, Lawyer.

W. McCormick Blair, Investment Banker.

William Scott Bond, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Thomas E. Donnelley, President R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co., Printers.

James H. Douglas, Jr., Lawyer.

Cyrus S. Eaton, Investment Banker.

Max Epstein, Chairman Board, General American Tank Car Corp.

Harry B. Gear, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Charles B. Goodspeed, Manufacturer.

Arthur B. Hall, Hall & Ellis, Real Estate.

Charles R. Holden, Vice-President, First National Bank of Chicago.

Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University.

Samuel G. Jennings, President Columbian Bank Note Co.

Frank H. Lindsay, Vice-President, Lindsay Bros., Farm Implements.

Frank McNair, Vice-President, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

Dr. Wilber E. Post, Physician.

Ernest E. Quantrell, previously Investment Banker.

Paul S. Russell, Vice-President, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., President, Joseph T. Ryerson & Son, Steel Manufacturers.

Albert L. Scott, President, Lockwood Greene Engineers, Inc.

Robert L. Scott, Treasurer and Director, Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co.

Albert W. Sherer, Vice-President, Lord & Thomas Advertising Co.

Eugene M. Stevens, Chairman Board, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

James M. Stifler, Secretary of the University.

John Stuart, President, Quaker Oats Co.

John P. Wilson, Lawyer.

Ten of the thirty members are alumni who, since their entrance into the University twenty to forty years ago, have been in a position to keep in especially close touch with the life and activities of the University.

I am an alumnus of the University of Chicago, having entered the University in the fall of 1903 and graduated in June, 1907. Continuously since entering the University I have been in active touch with University affairs, living most of the time within a mile of the University. After graduation I was active in alumni work; became a member of the Board of Trustees in 1914 and became President of the Board in 1922, in which capacity I have served since that time.

During this interval of time I have known a considerable number of faculty members representing a cross section of the whole group. I have also known a considerable number of undergraduate students ranging in numbers from forty to seventy-five each year, which I have done deliberately so that I might have intimate knowledge of what was going on in the University. Recently I have known several students whose parents were students in the University when I was, and, having this acquaintanceship with the children while continuing my friendship with the parents, has been particularly helpful in keeping in touch with the situation. Further, in conjunction with the Board of Trustees, I have examined carefully into the specific questions under consideration here.

I have no hesitancy in affirming that I am entirely convinced that there is no Communistic teaching in the University and that no member of the University faculty is a Communist. I am convinced that no faculty member advocates the violent overthrow of the government nor tries to instill such ideas in the minds of the students.

Under the circumstances of this meeting it is quite proper to put forward some outside evaluations of the University. According to every survey of which I have heard, the University of Chicago is rated as one of the two greatest universities in America. In the so-called Hughes report of 1925, in which twenty departments in all leading universities were given numerical rankings by the vote of specialists in each field, Chicago was rated first in more departments than any other university. In the 1934 report of the Committee on Graduate Instruction of the American Council on Education, based on a survey of thirty-five departments, or fields of knowledge, Harvard was found to have twenty-three distinguished departments, Chicago twenty-one.

In the publication, "American Men of Science," which lists the scientists of America and indicates by a star the names of those who are distinguished in their respective fields, Chicago has the greatest number of starred scientists in proportion to its faculty of any American university, and is second only to Harvard in the total number of starred scientists.

A study made in 1929 by the Secretary of the Association of American Colleges showed that the University of Chicago led all other institutions in producing teachers of distinction.

More Nobel Prizes (four) have been awarded to the University of Chicago scientists than to those of any other American university.

This record is the more remarkable when it is realized that the University of Chicago is one of the youngest of American universities (only forty-three years old), and has endowment funds less than half as large as that of Harvard, and well below that of some other Eastern universities.

The Board of Trustees is justly proud of the position of distinction which the University has attained and of the achievements of the faculty. It feels that to the people of the State of Illinois and of the entire Middle West the University is an institution of incalculable value. It believes that the standing of the University is due in large measure to the policies which from the beginning have characterized the administration of the University by its Board of Trustees; policies which have attracted and held in loyal service many of the outstanding scholars, scientists, and teachers of the world. It has complete confidence in the educational administration of the University and in its faculties, and it welcomes the opportunity of making its position clear to this committee and to the public.

Statement by Robert M. Hutchins

Your committee has the duty of discovering whether there is any foundation for the charge that "subversive communistic teachings and ideas advocating the violent overthrow" of the government "have been instilled in the minds of many students of certain tax-exempt colleges and universities in the State."

In this investigation, the University of Chicago is glad to cooperate. The charges made against the University are without foundation.

The University of Chicago has 901 teachers. They teach 3,492 courses. I am glad to hand the Committee the complete catalogue of the University indicating the nature and scope of its work. I have examined this material with care and find in it nothing of a subversive communistic character; nowhere is there the slightest indication that ideas advocating the violent overthrow of the government are instilled into the minds of students. If the Committee, on inspecting these documents, wishes further information about any course, we shall be glad to supply it.

I now wish to refer particularly to those courses dealing with social, political, and economic problems. I have here the complete outlines of 161 of these courses. There is nothing subversive in them. I present them to the Committee for examination. If the Committee wishes additional data in regard to any course we shall undertake to provide it.

I call your attention particularly to the syllabus in Social Science I, the general course taken by Freshmen and Sophomores. The references to Communism are entirely to books; these books discuss different views of the subject. For your convenience I have had separately printed the list of required and optional readings in this course. You will note the wide variety of subjects, authors, and attitudes which this list reveals. It is impossible to assert that students are being "indoctrinated."

Throughout its teaching the University attempts to discuss important problems critically, objectively, and scientifically. In order to guard against the effects of individual bias, the University deliberately appoints in the same department, men of widely different points of view. In the Department of Economics, for example, there are 17 men, one of whom is a Socialist, and the rest of whom range from progressive to reactionary Democrats and Republicans.

The members of the Faculty are law-abiding, patriotic citizens. Some of them, of course, are dissatisfied with current economic, social, and political conditions in this country. But they all believe in orderly change under the law. None of them advocates or has advocated the violent overthrow of the government. On behalf of the faculty, I repudiate the charges against them. Those who have made them are either ignorant, malicious, deluded or misinformed.

The University of Chicago has admittedly the strongest group of social scientists in the world. These men are not only engaged in teaching and research; they are also performing daily great services to this community.

Among the members of the Advisory Committee of the Committee on Citizenship and Naturalization are Chief Justice Jones of the Supreme Court; Paul C. Armstrong of the American Legion; Walter W. Williams of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce; Robert J. Dunham of the Illinois Emergency Relief; L. A. Downs, A. D. Lasker, Silas Strawn, Lawrence Armour and Howard Fenton.

Second, I call your attention to the work of the Chicago Recreation Commission. Four members of the University faculty serve on that Commission.

Third, in the present emergency the School of Social Service Administration has trained 75 per cent of the relief workers in Chicago. The Dean of the School is a member of the Advisory Board of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare. Three members of the faculty give courses about the state for the Emergency Relief Commission. No fees are charged and no compensation is paid by the Commission.

Fourth, Professor L. D. White was for two years a member of the Chicago Civil Service Commission and is now on leave as United States Civil Service Commissioner.

Fifth, Professor Simeon E. Leland is a member of the Illinois Tax Commission.

Sixth, in the important area of adult education, the University is represented by University College in the Loop which has 2,300 students and gives public lectures attended annually by several thousand more. Dean Huth of University College was last year President of the Adult Education Council of Chicago.

Seventh, the public school system has consistently relied on the University. Professor Works is chairman of the Advisory Committee of the new junior colleges. Professors Judd, Henry, and Morrison and our specialists in methods of teaching are in constant touch with the schools.

Eighth, Professor Jordan of the Department of Hygiene and Bacteriology, is a member of the Board of Health. Other members of the Department are on the Board's scientific staff.

Ninth, Professor Puttkammer of the Law School has had charge of the Police Training School and drew up the manual of instruction used in that school.

Tenth, Professors Merriam and Leland played an active part in the work of the Committee on the Rescue of Chicago and on Mayor Cermak's Advisory Committee.

Eleventh, all the departments of the local government, except fire and engineering, have used the work of the University Committee on Local Community Research. This material has been particularly useful to the Chicago Plan Commission. On this work the University has spent almost a million dollars since 1927.

Twelfth, there are now 17 national and international organizations of governmental officials affiliated with the University and housed next to the campus. These organizations, in cooperation with the University, are serving numerous departments of local government and countless states and municipalities.

These are merely samples of the kind of work constantly being done by the University for this community. If the staff of the University is to be subject to irresponsible attacks upon their loyalty and patriotism, the faculty will disintegrate and Chicago will lose not only the distinction of containing one of the great universities of the world, but also the invaluable services of the public spirited experts who are its professors.

Statement by Charles E. Merriam

My name is Charles E. Merriam; son of a civil war veteran, educated in an Iowa college, and in the universities of New York, Berlin and Paris; also in the great school of practical affairs. I may say that I have learned more from men than from books. I am a member of the Sons of the American Revolution and on the advisory committee of the Chicago Chapter. I did my part in the Great War and was decorated by the Italian government for services in that country.

I have served six years in the City Council of Chicago. I have been a member of many boards and commissions dealing with public questions in this city, county, and state—among others under Governor Deneen, Mayor Busse, Mayor Dever and Mayor Cermak. During all this time my devotion to the public interest has never been seriously challenged.

I have been connected with the University of Chicago for 35 years and have devoted much time to problems of American Civic education. I was a member of the Civic Education Committee under Superintendent Bogan; have had charge of a series of studies of comparative civic education in the leading countries of the world; and was for five years member of the National Commission on the Social Studies, contributing a volume on Civic Education in the United States (1934). I am chairman of the Department of Political Science, and am chiefly responsible for the type of civic education in the University of Chicago. I gladly assume that responsibility, for I am proud of our system of civic education which though by no means perfect, is sound and good. The attacks directed at the University are aimed chiefly at me and at my standing and work in this city and country. I resent these charges, insinuations, or innuendos against my life work in and for this city and the University and I denounce them as uninformed, false or malicious.

When did I become subversive or begin the overthrow of the American government? Within four years I was asked by Mayor Cermak to accept the presidency of the Board of Education of Chicago. Evidently he did not fear any subversive tendencies on my part. I was asked by Governor Horner if I would consider a position in his administration. I was appointed by President Hoover a member of the Committee on Recent Social Trends, evidently without fear that I would turn that body into a Communist factory. I was appointed by President Roosevelt a member of his important National Resources Board, and have been sitting there with five members of the President's Cabinet, none of whom has thus far appeared to fear revolutionary activities on my part. I have gone in and out among you for a generation and you cannot say I have not fought the fight or kept the faith with the people of this city and nation.

Who is it that now brings these charges against my Department and our system of civic education? What are their credentials and standing? What facts do they supply to discredit our work?

I charge these persons, wittingly or unwittingly, with attacking one of the strongest forces for the stabilization and maintenance of our civilization—our University. I charge them with efforts to break down and destroy one of the greatest centers of civic instruction and governmental research in America. I charge them with attempted grand larceny of human reputation and achievement.

The Department of Political Science deals with five fields of instruction and research. These are: Political Theory; Public Administration; Parties and Public Opinion; International Relations; and (with the Law School) Public Law. I am familiar with what is given in these courses (descriptions attached) and I know they are not subversive in character or tending toward violent overthrow of our government. On the contrary, they tend to raise the level of civic information, interest, and public spirited activity. Our students have gone out in hundreds over the United States and occupy important and responsible positions in industry, agriculture, professions, government all over the land. They are the living refutation of the lies that are being recklessly scattered about. To enumerate the list of law makers, administrators, judges who have studied with us, would occupy more than my time. I need name only one—the Honorable T. V. Smith, Senator from the 5th district of Illinois. I submit the constructive contributions of these men and women to American citizenship as an exhibit of what we are doing at the University and in our Department; and I rejoice that not all the shameless gossipy tongues in the world can dim the luster of that roll.

For the personnel of our Department I am chiefly responsible. Professor Leonard D. White is the leading authority in the United States on Public Administration—for two years civil service commissioner under Mayor Cermak, and now United States Civil Service Commissioner under President Roosevelt. In International Relations Professor Quincy Wright ranks as one of the most eminent men in his field. Louis Brownlow, Senator Henry Toll, Clarence Ridley, Charles Ascher, George Benson and others are on our list and also in the important group of governing officials located across the street from the University in order to maintain contact with our institution.

Among the younger men are Dr. Dimock in Public Administration, called upon by our War Department to render important services to that branch of the government; Dr. Kerwin, an unusually capable instructor in the earlier courses; Drs. Lasswell, Schuman, Gosnell, Lepawsky. I am chiefly responsible for the selection of these men and I know that none of these is a Communist or interested in inducing students to undertake the violent overthrow of our government.

I am responsible for the selection and retention of Dr. Schuman. He was one of my students, and is now one of our best teachers and most promising

research men in the field of international relations. He has been honored by the award of an important fellowship by the Social Science Research Council and again by the University of Pennsylvania. He is not a Communist, or a Socialist. There are doubtless some who think badly of him for voting for Roosevelt in the last election, but I am unable to regard that as subversive or unconstitutional. He once allowed his name to be used on a document he had not read, but many better men have made worse mistakes. I present these men and their teaching records and attainments as exhibits of the work of our Department.

If time permitted, I should be glad to submit to you an account of the constructive contributions made by these men to government in the United States. The list is long and extends into many different fields. (The Annual Report of the Department for 1934 is submitted.)

Some of these rank among the most important contributions made to the building up of our American political institutions in recent times. These works are open books, used throughout the United States and in other countries. I have yet to find anyone who called them subversive in tendency. On the contrary they have been received everywhere as valuable additions to the understanding of our institutions and to the enrichment of our political life.

Modesty forbids mention of my own works, but I ask you to read White's "Public Administration" and see if you find it subversive. The worst anyone might say is "soporific." I ask you to read Dimock's "Government Operated Enterprises in the Panama Canal Zone" and see if the War Department found it revolutionary. I ask you to examine Schuman's work on the Nazis and see if it helps or hinders our democratic institutions. I ask you to look at Gosnell's Non-Voting study and see what it subverts except indifference on the part of our voters. Lasswell's "World Politics" may contain some long words but I assure you there is no revolution lurking in its polysyllables.

I submit the constructive contributions made by members of our Department as an exhibit of our activities, and again assert that they show the trend and type of our efforts to aid in upbuilding American civilization and advance American political progress.

On the practical side we have aided in setting up the Public Administration Clearing House and the affiliated seventeen associations of governing officials, the greatest advance made toward building up honest and efficient administration in the history of America. This center of governmental experience and information stands out as one of the major achievements to which we have directed our efforts.

The Department of Political Science submits its personnel, its teaching courses and its research program and accomplishments, confident that when fully examined they will be found sound and constructive contributions to American citizenship and to better organization of our institutions and practices.

What we tend to subvert is not American institutions but misunderstanding, injustice, corruption, graft, waste, special privilege in American public life. If there is unrest in this land—and there is—and if many men in their bitterness and discontent reach out blindly in a feverish struggle to find a way out, then seek out the causes of discontent and cure them; otherwise the anguish and bitterness will grow greater, and the dangers rise. We did not close the banks of the United States—or water stock—or throw millions out upon the streets without a job. But we do our best to deal with the aftermath of these calamities, by building sound thinking for the future.

Only madness moves those who in the name of American liberty try to suppress thought on how that liberty may be preserved—or in the name of Americanism try to break down that system of free education upon which, as Jefferson pointed out, all democracy must rest. I raise my voice to say, looking back over thirty years of political observation and experience, that when free thought dies in our universities we may be sure that American liberty and American democracy have not long to live. The witch hunters can lead us only on a devil's dance that ends in the swamp.

For my part, I do not believe that America stands at the broken end of a worn out way. Avenues of greater opportunity than ever open out before this nation, if we can pioneer our way through and over difficulties as nobly as did our fathers in their day. To produce the skills, the attitudes, the spirit adequate to the achievement of the promise of American life, is the supreme challenge of civic and social education in our land. We count not ourselves to have attained at the University of Chicago, but we strive to follow after, and to do our part in the progressive development of our American civilization.

Flags

[Written in anticipation of Flag Day, June 14th]

Flags are but bits of cloth, that flare
  Against the wind and rain,
Which Nature never deigns to spare
  From either soil or strain,
But fouls and rends them at her will
As they were common fabric still.

Flags may be symbols in the thought
  Of such as love mankind,
To which the truly brave have brought
  Treasures of heart and mind
To offer them in holy mood
In troth to universal good.

Alas that men have made them less!
  That yet they flaunt them far,
Playthings of strutting pettiness,
  The bloody shrouds of war;
Too often but a lying rag,
The larger graft, the larger flag.

God make all flags one flag at last
  On every land and sea;
All reverences of the past
  Blended in one to be,
The reverence that all shall give,
All serving all that all may live.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Silver and Gold

That hungry men and women may eat
The amber hills are flayed of their wheat;
That houses may rear their hydra heads,
The woodland trees are uprooted from beds,
While gold is snatched from its earthy deep
For civilization's dungeon keep.
Yet the hillside blooms with perennial spring
While saplings arise in magic ring
And man alone is enslaved to bars,
For the gold of earth has dimmed his stars.

MARGARET LATHROP LAW.

Senator Long, Father Coughlin, Dr. Townsend:
Demagogues Or Deliverers!

Three men conspicuous at this moment in the nation's life, and engaged in significant enterprises of reform which may mean much to the future of this republic for weal or woe, are Senator Huey Long, the Kingfish of Louisiana, Father Coughlin, the radio-priest of Detroit, and Dr. Townsend, the father of the Townsend Plan, of California. There are other men whom I might name in this general category of classification, for these are not the only men who would save the people in this hour of disaster. But I have chosen to confine myself to these three—first, because they have the largest popular following in all parts of the country; secondly, because they promise, like a gathering storm, to loom darker, and yet darker, upon the horizon of the nation's life; and thirdly, because they illustrate, each in his own peculiar way, the possibilities of public leadership and control in this extraordinary age of the radio, the newsreel, and the movies. It is almost paralyzing to remember that no one of these three men had a national audience, or any influence outside a restricted area, as recently as 1929. The fountains of the great deep were broken up in that tremendous year, and some strange and even dangerous forms of life were shot up to the surface.

The most impressive of these three men is Father Coughlin, whose career has undergone an amazing evolution during the last three years, the end of which is not yet. He began as a modest and zealous priest who had a social conscience, a genuine abhorrence of injustice and evil, a compassion for the poor, oppressed and miserable among the people, and a sound understanding of the application of religion to political and economic questions. These qualities are with him still, but are rapidly being overlaid, it seems to me, with all the dire consequences of great and sudden popular success. More than a year ago, Father Coughlin found himself standing at a fork in the road. On the one hand, broad and smooth to his feet, ran the pathway of demagoguery; on the other hand, straight and narrow, ran the pathway of statesmanship. The difference between the two pathways is perfectly clear—there is no reason for any man, though he be a fool, to err therein.

Thus, the demagogue is always interested in himself, whereas the statesman, in the higher ethical and spiritual sense of the word, is always interested in his cause.

The demagogue is led by prejudices, and the statesman by principles.

The demagogue appeals to passion, and the statesman to intelligence.

The demagogue consults the desires of the people, that he may cater to them; the statesman seeks out the needs of the people, that he may satisfy them.

The demagogue would use the people for his own personal aggrandizement; the statesman would be used by the people at the cost of any sacrifice of personal interest and favor.

The demagogue is moved predominantly by arrogance and pride; the statesman by the humility of the "meek and lowly of heart."

The demagogue is invariably violent, cruel, and abusive; the statesman is almost invariably reasonable, good-natured, considerate, courteous, and kind.

The demagogue is in temper and ambition an autocrat; the statesman, on the contrary, is democratic, with "a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people."

The demagogue is of the classic type of Critias, Catiline, Danton, and Lloyd George. The statesman is of the equally classic type of Pericles, Timoleon, Sir Thomas More, and Abraham Lincoln.

Which of these examples Father Coughlin has chosen to follow may still be doubtful. But it must be said that there are increasing indications in his thought and speech of passion, prejudice, and brutal lust of power. The arrogance of this man, in recent months, has become wellnigh insufferable. His leadership, on any public question, is downright unscrupulous and base. One wonders how much longer, for all his unquestioned gifts of oratory, he can command the attention and hold the confidence of the people. Let me cite some of the items on the record:

For months Father Coughlin has been advocating legislation by Congress in the interest of silver. At the same time, as we now know, he was investing thousands of dollars, gathered in from the free-will offerings of his hearers, in silver futures bought on narrow margin, and therefore held in the pure spirit of speculation. When originally charged with this offense, the Detroit priest denied, as he has more recently denied, that he ever held an ounce of silver in his own name, or anybody else's. This statement was technically true, inasmuch as the silver in question was purchased by the Radio League of the Little Flower, an organization belonging to Father Coughlin, but not Father Coughlin himself.

In 1934, Father Coughlin appeared before a Congressional Committee in Washington, to oppose certain proposed birth control legislation then pending. In his statement before the Committee, this Catholic priest identified birth control with sodomy, and described matrimony so controlled as "a legalized bed of prostitution." He charged that men supporting this legislation were desirous of making their wives mere "play toys." He charged that the purpose of birth control was to teach "how to commit fornication and get away with it—how to commit adultery and not get caught." That any man has a right to oppose birth control goes without saying, but I venture to assert that no man has a right to slander and defame its advocates. What Father Coughlin's testimony revealed on this occasion was total ignorance of the question, plus an inherently and disgustingly dirty mind.

Some weeks ago Father Coughlin, in one of his Sunday afternoon radio addresses, presented a searching and scathing indictment of the Roosevelt economic policy. A few days later the publishing house of Harcourt, Brace & Co. announced that more than half of this address had been taken verbatim from the pages of their book, "The Economic Consequences of the New Deal," written by Benjamin Stollberg, and when thus unexpectedly

exposed, Father Coughlin expressed his regret, and stated that in the published edition of his address, he would use quotation marks!

Father Coughlin's opposition to the entrance of the United States into the World Court is too well-known to require comment. On this occasion, the radio priest joined hands with Mr. Hearst in denouncing, on the narrowest and most bigoted nationalistic grounds imaginable, one of the few hopes of peace now left to a frightened and distracted world. Next only to his despicable journalistic associate, Father Coughlin is most largely responsible for the defeat of a measure which must have the support of all unselfish and enlightened men.

Such are some of the items in the record of Father Coughlin. Can there be much longer any doubt as to how he is to be classified among the public leaders of our day?

The most important of the three men, of whom I am speaking this morning, is Senator Huey Long. What particularly impresses me about this man are the contradictions which seem to be central to his character and career. For example:

Senator Long is a vulgarian of the first order. Yet he is able, brilliant, and industrious.

He is unquestionably one of the most ignorant men in public life today. Yet he has a respect for education and a devotion to the high interests of culture which are almost a superstition.

He is a politician of the very lowest order of American experience. Yet as Governor he gave to the people an administration which placed Louisiana in not a few respects among the leading states of the American republic.

He is moved again and again by the meanest passions of hatred and revenge; he carries in his pocket, we are told, a little book, with an obscene title, in which he records the names of those whom he proposes to ruin. Yet he is capable of the most generous acts of kindness and goodwill.

He is an exhibitionist of the most extraordinary type; his juvenile simplicity in this regard outmatches the naivete of a college sophomore. Yet, at the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1932, at a critical moment when he held the attention of the nation, he made a speech of surpassing restraint and dignity.

He is a dictator to the core—violent, cruel, unscrupulous, and autocratic. Yet he has a genuine love for the people, and a sincere concern for their economic and social welfare.

He is the one man in public life most easily and alarmingly to be compared with Adolf Hitler. Yet I wonder if it would not be more accurate to compare him with Andrew Jackson, who brought the same shock of surprise and disgust, as well as of audacious personal leadership, to the sober, respectable people of his day that Senator Long seems to be bringing to the same kind of people in our day?

Is this man a demagogue? It all depends on whether, Hamlet-like, we look on this picture, or on that. But, demagogue or not, of this thing I am convinced—that the importance of Senator Long in the life of this country at the present moment cannot be exaggerated. We have laughed at him for a long time, just as the German people laughed at Adolf Hitler. But as there came an hour when the Germans discovered that the Nazi was not a clown, but, on the contrary, one of the most formidible personalities of the modern world, so there may come an hour when we will be waked up to realization of the fact that the Kingfish is a political figure of terrifying significance and power. His definite announcement that he proposes to run for the presidency in 1936, not altogether unlike Hitler's candidacy for the presidency of the Reich, is a fact which may well sober us to serious attention.

Least important, but most attractive, among the three men whom I have named, is Dr. Townsend, of California. This man has the unique distinction of being one of the most talked about and least known public figures in the country today. If he has not impressed himself personally upon the popular imagination, it is largely because he lacks every element of color and sensation. In the extreme sense of the word, he is a simple man—a skilled and faithful physician, a good neighbor and loyal friend. Outside of his own profession he has little knowledge and no experience. Two qualities predominate in his nature—a kind heart, which has been moved in pity for his fellowmen, and an ingenious mind, which has conceived a scheme of reform which has captured the imagination of millions of men and women. In nothing that Dr. Townsend has said or done, is there a single trace of the demagogue. On the contrary, he is an unselfish and devoted man, who sincerely believes himself to be the deliverer of a troubled generation.

II.

Such are the three men who stand so conspicuously in the forefront of the nation's attention at this hour. They are very different—and yet in certain important aspects they are well-nigh identical.

Thus, they all have programs for the solution of the nation's ills. Of these I speak below.

Also, they all have organizations, or societies, for the support of their programs and the advancement of their cause. Father Coughlin has established his "National Union for Social Justice," and announced his intention of securing a membership of not less than five million supporters. That he will be able to attain and perhaps exceed this large total of adherents, I do not doubt for a single moment. Senator Long has put into the field his "National Share-Our-Wealth Society," which is organized on the basis of local membership units. The latest reports indicate that there are more than two thousand of these units, in Louisiana and in several other states, with a membership well over a million. This Society will be the core of the Kingfish's campaign for President in the next election. Dr. Townsend has scattered Townsend Plan groups of citizens in all parts of the country. The groups are said to have presented to Congress a petition bearing fifteen million names. That the good Doctor has mustered any such army as this, I do not believe, but that he has an enormous body of supporters is obvious to anybody who is in touch with the trends of the times.

Again, these men are alike in the fact that they are all three in politics. Father Coughlin has announced that he is not, and will not be, a candidate for public office, but he has a lobby in Washington in support of his proposed currency legislation which is second only in efficiency and zeal to the lobby of the American Legion. Senator Long, as I have said, is a confessed candidate for the presidency, and is already far advanced in his campaign. Dr. Townsend has introduced into Congress a bill for the enactment of his plan, and is bending every effort to secure its prompt and favorable consideration. If President Roosevelt's policies have been thrown into almost hopeless confusion and delay, it is largely because of the intrusion upon the political scene of these three powerful and determined men.

III.

But it is time that we came to the consideration of the programs of the priest, the senator, and the physician, for these are central to any understanding of our question. What is it that these men are proposing? What ideas and recommendations are they offering to the acceptance of the American people? What do they want to do?

The least important of these programs is Father Coughlin's, which is incoherent, inconsistent, and absurd. Its sixteen points, which might as well have been six or sixty, are obviously the aberrations of a mind which has no fundamental knowledge of affairs, no vestige of political or economic training, and no real understanding of the nature of the present crisis. The program would be ludicrous if it were not so seriously presented as a remedy for the tragic ills which are afflicting the nation's life.

Of the various planks, gathered as a bird gathers stray bits of debris for the building of its nest, ten are the commonplace platitudes of reform discussion for the last fifty or more years. Thus we read, in terms so general as to mean anything or nothing, that the radio priest believes in "preferring the sanctity of human rights to the sanctity of property rights," in "the simplification of government," in "nationalizing public necessities" but in the "private ownership of all other property," in "liberty of conscience and education," in "a just and living annual wage," in "upholding the right to private property yet in controlling it for the public good," in "the duty of the Government to protect (the labor unions) against the vested interests of wealth and of intellect." Alone distinctive among these principles of social justice are six financial planks, which call for the nationalization of banks and money, the Congressional control of currency, a steady currency value, the "recall of all non-productive bonds," and the "abolition of tax-exempt bonds."

It is evident that, central to all of Father Coughlin's thought, as monotonously reiterated in his Sunday afternoon radio addresses, is the currency question. This gives infallible insight into his mind, for of two things you can be sure. First, that no great mind at work upon the social question has ever regarded the problem of the currency as primary to its solution! On the contrary, the great mind has always known that money is not a reality in itself but only a sign or symbol, so to speak, of the genuine realities of economic life. The currency problem, therefore, has always been recognized as subsidiary or derivative, and therefore never to be placed in the forefront of any program of reform. Secondly, and per contra, the ignorant mind, or the feeble mind, is invariably obsessed by the currency riddle. This is the sure sign of the "crank"—that he can't talk or think about anything except money! Listen to Father Coughlin on any Sunday afternoon, and see if his mind is not dominated by a mania on this question. For this reason, if for no other, Father Coughlin's program is not to be taken seriously, nor the man himself to be regarded as other than a menace to all that is sane, sound, and wholesome in the nation's life.

Dr. Townsend's program is popular, and therefore widely known. He would have the government pay $200 a month to all citizens who are over sixty years of age and who have no criminal record, on the express and sole condition that the recipients spend this money each month within the borders of the country. No person can save any of his dole, but must spend it all. To secure the money necessary for this enormous monthly payment, Dr. Townsend would have the government levy a tax on every business transaction—a tax at first estimated, if I am correctly informed, at two per cent, but now prudently raised to ten per cent.

To discuss this scheme with any seriousness is quite impossible. All that one needs is a grammar-school knowledge of arithmetic, and a few simple statistics on population and business, to prove with a minimum of figuring that the plan is utterly fantastic. But, apart from the facts of dollars and cents, is the theory of the thing! By what insanity is anybody persuaded that the depression can be lifted, and the country saved economically, by taxing all the people to the end of distributing lavish bounty to a few of the people? Can purchasing power be increased and business thereby stimulated by taking away some of the purchasing power of younger people and transferring it to older people? Is it the mere movement of money that holds the key to the mystery? But what is money, and how can it be increased or made fruitful by merely moving it about? After all, there is only so much money in the country. It does not grow on trees, or spring out of the ground, or hide away in limitless amount in treasury vaults, that it can be used indefinitely for the pensioning of millions of our citizens. For money is nothing but the symbol, or token, of the wealth produced by the labor of hand and brain. Dr. Townsend, innocent man, does not concern himself with the vexing problem of the production of goods; he is not interested, apparently, in the still more vexing problem of the distribution of goods. He never thinks of the relation between consumption and wealth. Like Father Coughlin, all he can think about is money, and what money will do for people if by some hokus-pokus he can get it passing through their hands.

The central idea in Dr. Townsend's Plan, of course, is circulation—the circulation not of goods, be it noted, but of currency. His 60-year old pensioners must spend their money as fast as they get

it! Dr. Townsend seems to feel that if he can only get money moving fast enough, and keep it moving, then everything will be all right. There is so much money, let us say, in this pocket, and so much in this other pocket! Now the Doctor would start the money in this pocket moving into this other pocket, and keep it moving fast, and faster, and ever faster. By virtue of this movement, apparently, we will all suddenly become prosperous. Dr. Townsend, in other words, is applying to the problem of finance our good old principle of perpetual motion. It reminds me of the man who came to see me, some years ago, with the solemn announcement that he had invented a machine which solved the riddle of perpetual motion. All my life I had been watching and waiting for that man—and that machine! So I asked him to let me see his machine. A few days later he arrived at my study with a box as big as a trunk, and with reverent deliberation put together the parts of his apparatus. I can see now the elaborate tangle of wheels and pulleys that rose two feet or more above the level of my desk. At last the machine was ready! The inventor stood by his contrivance, and with awed tones, he said to me: "Mr. Holmes—there it is! Now all we've got to do is to get it started right, and it will go forever."

That's the perfect picture, it seems to me, of Dr. Townsend's Plan. All we've got to do is to get that $200 a month moving through the hands of all the 60-year old people in this country, and prosperity will be here. It's amazing that any man, let alone millions of men, can be so naive. Dr. Townsend is an ingenious, kindly, unselfish man—but, alas, he has done nothing but outmatch the immortal Lewis Carroll in the amazing adventures of his "Alice in Wonderland."

Huey Long's program is aptly described by his two slogans—"Share Our Wealth," and "Every Man a King." This program has seven items which have to do with the abolition of poverty, the limitation of wealth, "free higher education for all," old-age pensions, compensation for veterans, and the removal of unemployment through shorter hours and extensive public works. In essence the program boils down to two proposals. First, that every individual in the country shall have not less than $5,000 a year, together with a home, a job, a radio, and an automobile! Secondly, that great fortunes shall be prohibited, and that all property above $10,000,000 (originally $3,000,000!) shall be confiscated by government by the process of taxation.

Is this program practicable, and, if practicable, wise? There can be no question, it seems to me, that it is entirely practicable to tax the great fortunes in this country not so much out of existence as to the uses of the government in its service of the common weal. I have always been in favor of the taxation of large incomes as one of the surest and wisest methods of leveling the great mountain peaks of wealth accumulation. Exactly this policy has been proposed for war-time, as a method of paying the huge expense of war; why should not the same policy be proposed, and acted upon, as a method of carrying the inequitable burden of vast poverty in the midst of incalculable wealth? But Senator Long would use this method of appropriating the fortunes of the rich to public uses, as a means of distributing the available wealth of the country. He would scale down all property to a maximum of $10,000,000, that the wealth so secured by government may immediately be passed over to the impoverished masses of the people, in such ways that every family shall have at least $5,000, and a few of the more commonplace luxuries of life. But what guarantee does the Senator offer that the confiscated wealth will be at all adequate to meet the needs, even on the not extravagant basis of his system of compensation, of those multitudes of Americans who now have nothing? And even if he could work out his project of distribution—granted that there would be enough money to go around, at the rate of $5,000 per family—what program does he offer to insure that the wealth thus distributed will stay distributed?

The fatal weakness in Huey Long's program, it seems to me, is to be found in the fact that it is nothing in the world but a most naive scheme of "dividing up." The Senator would seize all available wealth in this country, above a certain average, and then proceed to pass it 'round, so much for family or person. But what we need, in this crisis of the nation's affairs, is not a grand ceremony of "sharing wealth," but on the contrary a genuine scientific system of distribution which will make any accumulation and any sharing of wealth forevermore impossible. Senator Long gives us no such system. He tells us nothing about what would happen or should happen after his great "sharing" had been accomplished. Apparently he relies upon the income or capital tax to cut off the surplus of any fortune that might rise above his allotted maximum, and upon the government straightway to distribute this surplus to any unfortunates who had lost even the $5,000, or perhaps the radio and automobile, originally bestowed upon them. But any serious program of reform would establish an economy which would make it impossible, as in Russia, for any individual to grow rich, and equally impossible for any honest worker to grow poor. Senator Long is not a statesman, he is a sentimentalist. Pitying the poor, like Robin Hood, he would seize the money of those who have too much, and give it to those who have too little, or nothing at all. Even in the glades of Sherwood Forest, this was a questionable procedure. In the intricate complexities of modern political and industrial life, it is impossible. Senator Long is as simple, if not as ingenious and original, as Dr. Townsend.

IV.

Such are the programs of these three men, who would deliver the nation from its woes. These programs are interesting, even amusing, but they are not helpful. Much of their substance is sheer demagoguery, and the rest but fragments of plans far sounder than themselves. But not for this reason is any one of these three men to be regarded lightly or with indifference. Senator Long and Father Coughlin and Dr. Townsend are profoundly significant, if not as deliverers, than as signs of the times in which we live.

Thus, these men are valid voices of discontent, echoing from coast to coast the deep-seated unrest

of the American people. If the Kingfish and the priest and the physician are powerful today, it is because the great masses of this country, disillusioned, disappointed, in despair, are looking not merely for mouthpieces of their complaint but also for leaders of their revolt. The mood of the multitudes is increasingly a Messianic mood. The temper of our people is like that of the Jews in the time of Jesus. Ground down by the hand of the oppressor, defeated, despoiled, and desperate, these ancient Jews prayed for a Messiah, and lived in daily expectation of a divine deliverer who should descend out of heaven and restore the ancient glories of the kingdom of David. Jesus was not the only savior of his age. There were Messiahs before him, as there were Messiahs after—and as there will be Messiahs in every age which has fallen upon disaster and exhausted, apparently, the devices of deliverance which lie within the control of man. Such a period is now upon us in this country. We have fallen into a depression from which there seems to be no rescue. Year after year passes, only to make way for other years which promise no decisive change in the condition of the people. The high hopes, stirred by Mr. Roosevelt in the first two years of his administration, have now faded into the forbidding darkness of futility and failure. What is there left but just such wild promises and pledges as are now offered by ignorant and irresponsible men? Senator Long and Father Coughlin and Dr. Townsend have appeared at the right moment. Had it not have been these, it would have been some others to match the expectant longing, the insistent demands, of the times. The mounting enthusiasm for such men is the precise measure of the growing discontent of the popular mind. The millions who claim membership in the League for Social Justice and the Share-Our-Wealth Society and the Townsend Plan groups—these are the rising tide of rebellion which may sooner or later engulf the land.

Secondly, these men, of whom we are speaking this morning, are immensely important as avowed crusaders against the greatest evil of modern times, with the single exception of war. I refer to the evil of the inequitable distribution of wealth. All three of these men are aiming at this wrong. Whether it be Huey Long with his idea of sharing among all the people the available property of the nation, or Father Coughlin with his program of multiplying the currency to meet the needs of our citizens, or Dr. Townsend with his scheme of pensions for men and women over sixty years of age, all are agreed that it is fundamentally wrong that the few should be rich and the many poor. These men would end the injustice of the present order by giving to all the people their appropriate share of the wealth which their labor has produced. Their plans for securing an equitable distribution of this wealth may be utterly crazy, their purposes demagogic and dangerous. But they are making a valid attack upon a monstrous evil, and therewith leading a movement which has been too long delayed.

Again, these men are proclaiming a new end and aim of social action—namely, economic security. They believe that the economic hazards of modern industry, on farm and in factory alike, should be lifted from the helpless shoulders of the workers. They insist, and rightly insist, that every man, woman, and child should be granted by the state the protection which the individual can no longer win and hold for himself. This is a new demand in our American life—a demand which seems strange to many an American ear. For a century and a half, we have lived upon the basis of the principle that society should provide equality of opportunity, and then leave every individual alone to make his own way and meet his own fortune. But this was a principle for a pioneer society. It belonged to a period which was dominated by the concept, and reality, of the frontier. But now the frontier has gone. Life has suddenly become crowded, and complicated, and complex. The single man is helpless in the great mass of the multitude, and the single worker insignificant as a mere cog in a vast machine. Hence the discovery of a new function of government! That the state shall protect its citizens from the economic invasion of their homes by unemployment and poverty, exactly as it protects its citizens from the military invasion of their soil by alien foes! In both cases there is the menace of disaster and death, and in both cases, therefore, the rightful claim on government for security. It is this security, in the economic sense of the word, which constitutes the latest duty of a nation to its people. In recognizing and proclaiming this duty, Senator Long, Father Coughlin and Dr. Townsend are voicing the supreme demand of our contemporary age.

Lastly, these men confront us as a warning. Their plans I regard as at bottom unsound, dangerous, and demagogic. If adopted, in whole or in part, they will wreck and not save us all. But let me tell you that, if we get no saner policies than these proposed by "the pied pipers," as General Johnson calls them, we will get these in default of anything better. To be specific—if Mr. Roosevelt accomplishes no more in the next two years than he has accomplished in the last two, then we may be sure that the people will turn for their deliverance to wilder if less amiable men. The crumbling confidence in the President is the surest sign we have today of the seriousness of these men who wait upon his failure to begin their work. For of this thing we may be sure—that the people are not going back, much less are they going to stand still. They are going forward, if not under wise guidance, then under guidance not so wise.

At present the prospect is dark. Irresponsible men are winning the support of a disillusioned and discouraged people. It reminds me of Jeremiah's time, when the prophet declared, "A horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and the people love to have it so."

But if the night comes, so also in due course must come the day. May we not match a Hebrew prophet with a Christian apostle? For I think of Peter who, in his time, spoke of "wells without water, and clouds that are carried with the wind to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever."

But he also said, as we may say, if we see aright, "We have a more sure road of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawns, and the day star ariseth in your hearts."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Senate Resolution 141*

Whereas the people of the United States, irrespective of political affiliations, have been desirous of promoting in every practical way the peace of the world and the economic and political welfare of other nations as well as their own, and have never failed to respond to the call of distress of other peoples and countries; and

Whereas the people of the United States are equally desirous of correcting any misapprehensions in this regard and to proclaim that no reason shall exist for questioning their desire to aid in every reasonable way the solution of the acute problems of the world arising from the war and the depression; and

Whereas the present administration has frequently declared that national economic recovery and world economic recovery are inextricably bound together and that the principle of the good neighbor should characterize the relationship between the United States and all other nations; and

Whereas similar views have been held by Republican administrations and leading statesmen of the Republican Party, so that these broad views have the endorsement of both our major political parties; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that there is no problem existing today which is operating more directly, constantly, and powerfully to make understanding and good will between nations difficult, and therefore to postpone the return of economic wellbeing and durable world peace than the chronic problem of inter-governmental debts arising and resulting from the war; and

Whereas the next installment of allied war debts owing to the United States is due and payable on the 15th of June, 1935, and no payment on these debts was made when the last installment came due on December 15, 1934, and the value and collectibility of these debts are becoming more and more jeopardized by the passing of time and the failure to devise and consummate a workable and mutually reasonable settlement thereof; and

Whereas such officials and leaders of European public opinion and action as Premier Flandin, of France; Economic and Finance Minister Schacht, of Germany; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer Chamberlain, of Great Britain, have within recent weeks given public indication of their recognition of the gravity of the problem created by the unsettled state of inter-governmental debts and of their desire for an equitable settlement that will promote and not retard world trade and that is in keeping with the present economic and financial conditions of the world; and

Whereas in June and also in December of 1934, in the exchange of notes on the allied-debt subject, both France and Great Britain did not repudiate them but frankly acknowledged that validity and legality of their respective war debts to the United States and expressed a desire and willingness to make a reasonable and feasible settlement of these debts; and

Whereas it is the desire of the people of the United States as indispensable both to economic recovery and to world peace to secure reduction of armaments by all nations and to inaugurate an immediate 5-year holiday in arms construction, in order to facilitate and insure rapid recovery from the ravages of the protracted depression and to prove good faith to one another in their treaty commitments to peace; and

Whereas general and drastic reduction of armaments is vital to both world peace and to economic recovery, the expenditures for armaments and war being by far the largest items in the budgets of the nations; and

Whereas responsible statesmen of all the large nations of the world have repeatedly expressd their willingness to join in a general universal movement for the reduction of armaments, but the disarmament conferences have, during the past few years, failed to reach any substantial accord as to reduction largely because of the ill will, fear, and resentments engendered, particularly in Europe, by the destructiveness of the last war and the treaties resulting therefrom; and

Whereas a strong indication of the sentiment in Great Britain has just been obtained by a popular referendum wherein the vote on the question of all-round drastic reduction of armaments by international agreement showed over 90 per cent in favor of such reduction and agreement, a percentage that well represents the overwhelming public opinion of our land; and

Whereas a 5-year holiday in arms construction accompanied by gradual drastic, and pro rata reduction in arms, agreed to and carried out by the nations of the world, would be not only the sincerest guarantee of world peace but would also result in bringing national income and national expenditures within balance in all nations, would greatly reduce taxation, would vastly increase the buying power of all countries, and consequently would go far toward restoring to normal the benefits of the world trade, both for agriculture and for the industry; and

Whereas for the further advancement of world trade and therefore for the prosperity of all peoples there should be a revival of confidence in the money units of the world, now so disordered and almost chaotic, by a working stabilization of international currencies under international agreement, such as would inspire confidence in business men and producers everywhere, and which would largely restore normal foreign trade, thus tending to relieve unemployment and to reflate our sadly deflated market value of commodities, securities, and real estate; and

Whereas the United States, by reason of its unprecedented contributions to the World War, its unselfish and equally unprecedented abstention from all the spoils of war at the peace table, in harmony with the magnanimous pronouncements of President McKinley in 1898, and of President Wilson in 1917 (namely, that it is our settled policy not to wage wars of aggression and not to accept the spoils of victory), is in a position to take the lead in a world-wide movement for the solution of these four acute international problems, (1) war debts, (2) disarmament, (3) stabilization of currencies, and (4) a sound revival of world trade, which now so harass the world and retard both

*Tuesday, May 21, Senator Tydings of Maryland introduced Senate Resolution No. 141. Following his address the Senator secured leave to print in full in the record the plan entitled "Liquidating World Depression," by S. O. Levinson, which was first published in full in UNITY of March 18 last.

economic recovery and world peace, and to the solution of which a world conference should be called to be held at the city of Washington at the earliest convenient and practicable time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to advise such governments as he may deem appropriate that this Government desires at once to take up directly with them, with a view to entering into international agreements and treaties with other nations at a conference to be held in the city of Washington, the following matters: The settlement of the inter-governmental debts, the means of obtaining a substantial curtailment in world armaments and a holiday in world armament construction, the means of securing a stabilization of the currency systems of the world, and the means for reviving world trade, all to such an extent and under such terms as may be agreed upon.

The Study Table

After the Crucifixion

This second book* about Jesus, written by the author of Mary of Nazareth, keeps to the same high level of beauty, reverence, and deep insight into the character of Jesus and his immediate circle of followers which was so characteristic of her former book. The story begins with the crucifixion, and carries through to the days following the resurrection. Considerable space is given to the Passover supper. The participating characters are sketched with sympathy, and one gets vivid impressions of the sort of people they are, at least as the author sees them. Homely details and patient drudgery of housework are brought into the picture and serve to make especially clear the warm hearted hospitality of the women of the group. Mary of Nazareth is kept in the background, as was natural after she had been made the central figure in the author's previous book.

The most distinctive personage in this book is Mary Magdalene. The author has no hesitation in describing her as a professional harlot of Magdala, of challenging beauty, and passionately devoted to Jesus who has wrought in her a work of complete transformation of character. Indeed your reviewer gets the impression that the author intends us to believe that the Magdalene is deeply "in love" with Jesus, so much so that she is the one follower who becomes convinced that her master has risen from the dead. This conviction springs from her experience at or near the sepulcher, whether psychic or otherwise, is not made clear by the author. One of the best passages in the book is the description of Mary as she hastens breathless but exulting to bring the great news to the disciples, huddling and hiding in or near the Jerusalem home where the last supper had been eaten. With face transfigured, her long hair flying, she bursts gloriously into the amazed group. It is she and no one else who is responsible for the complete turn about which took place in the minds of the frightened and discouraged followers of the Nazarene.

Such books as these of Mary Borden, and the one recently reviewed in UNITY, "Jesus," by Fleg, serve in a very appealing way to satisfy the longing expressed in the hymn we used to sing, "I think when I read that sweet story of old," etc. Indeed it seems a bit chilling even to suggest any of the critical questions that arise. And yet perhaps it is as well for ardent spiritual and ethical followers of the great teacher to reread the closing words of Albert Schweitzer's work, "The Quest of the Historical Jesus." Perhaps there is no more outstanding disciple of Jesus than he, at least in the utter devotion with which he has put his discipleship into good works. And yet after years of painstaking and scholarly research Schweitzer has reached the deliberate conclusion that from the documentary evidence so far available there is no possibility of reconstructing a life of the historical Jesus. That is lost in the dim obscurity of an irrecoverable past. It is better so. "The letter killeth."

And yet, paradoxically, one hopes that the Mary Bordens will keep on with their efforts to make real the facts and impressions of those memorable days and years. For the conviction will not down with those for whom the words of the childhood hymn bring a sweet and haunting nostalgia that if ever humanity succeeds in achieving civilization it will be when the spirit of Jesus has been lovingly adopted by his comrades of the common life.

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

*King of the Jews, by Mary Borden. Published by Little, Brown and Company. $2.50.

Two Servants of God

During the height of the Civil Disobedience Movement in India an American idealist, Edward Holton James, went to India to study the Non-Cooperation Movement and wrote his most interesting and instructive work on the Indian situation, "I Tell Everything" (published by Kundig & Co., Geneva, Switzerland). In this book Mr. James gave a vivid description of his visit to the North Western Frontier Province of India and his personal observations, derived from association with Dr. Khansahib and other leaders of the Indian Nationalist movement. Mr. James heard from British officials about the *Reds,* Soviet Russian Agents, menacing British rule in India at the North-Western frontiers of India; and after a very careful investigation he found that this so-called *Red Shirt Movement* was primarily a movement for Social Reform and progressive religious idealism among the Moslems of the North-Western Frontiers, led by two most enlightened and religious men—Dr. Kahnsahib and his younger brother Abdul Gaffar Khan, generally known as the Frontier Gandhi. Naturally, this religious reform movement supported the Indian national movement—the All India National Congress. Because of this fact, the British Government in India has persecuted these two Moslem leaders of India and all the members of their family and their important followers.

Mr. Mahadev Desai, the private Secretary of Mahatma Gandhi, at the suggestion of his Master, has written the little book "Two Servants of God"† to give some authentic account of the life of these two leaders of India, who have already played an important part in the progress of Indian nationalist movement and who are staunch supporters of Hindu-Moslem unity and are advocates of Non-violence. The author designates Dr. Khansahib and his brother Abdul Gaffar Khan, as two servants of God; because the latter organized a society which was known as *"Khudai Khidmatgars"*

†Two Servants of God, by Mahadev Desai, Hindustan Times Press. Delhi, 1935. Pages 106. Price Re I.

which is translated as "Servants of God." The members of this society on enlistment take the following simple oath: "(1) To be loyal to God, the Community and the Motherland; (2) To be always non-violent; (3) To expect no reward for services; (4) To eschew fear and be prepared for any sacrifice and (5) To live a pure life." The late Hon. Gokhale organized the *Servant of India Society.* The late Lala Lajpat Rai organized the *Servant of the People Society.* Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan organized *the Society of Servants of God* and inspired his followers to serve his people and work for freedom of India, in co-operation with the All India National Congress, with religious zeal. For this supposed offense he had to suffer imprisonment and torture on various occasions. Abdul Gaffar Khan started constructive work among his people by establishing a school in his village. The British authorities regarded such an activity as anti-British and *Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan "was sentenced to three years rigorous imprisonment for the offense of teaching the Pathan boys in his own way."* The book not only gives interesting information regarding the sufferings of Indian patriots, but it shows that righteousness does not know the boundary of creed or color, because Rev. Wigram, a Christian missionary played an important part in the early education of these men. Abdul Gaffar Khan and his brother are followers of Islam, but they see good in all religions. To them "Islam is *amal, Yakeen, muhabatt,* (right conduct, faith, love) and without these one calling a Musalman is like sounding brass and tinkling cymbals" (p. 31).

TARAKNATH DAS.

Correspondence

The World a Madhouse?

Editor of UNITY:

His Excellency, the Governor of Massachusetts, is disconcerting his liberal-minded supporters by pronouncements in favor of increased tariffs. They had hopefully regarded him as being superior to the political quackery of a "protective" tariff, which had its early advocacy by Hamilton, who urged its benefits, especially to workmen, for it would enable workmen to find employment in the factories for wife and children. Since then child labor in our civilization, which shocked the Indian Chief who was being conducted through our industrial plants on his visit to the Great White Father, lies under the odium which it and its former advocates deserve. The full dinner pail of McKinley, the "foreigner paying the tax," a chicken in every pot, "the abolition of poverty" (before Sinclair's E.P.I.C), are on the way out in the minds of clear thinkers. How the lobbyists, since the Civil War and up to the present day, could keep a straight face while urging a "protective" tariff for Americans against cheap foreign labor, and at the same time "increasing the load" and cutting wages by various devices, is a marvel in forensic craft and effrontery. This class of mankind, for whom Buckle has adopted the epithet of "Contrivers," well know that no matter what the nominal figure, wage in all countries is on the mere subsistence base. In recent textile disputes the case has been given away when the owners deplored the tactics of "outside agitators" by causing strikes when the help could not afford to loaf a week!

Fifty years ago, April 1, 1885, Henry George addressing a Knights of Labor Assembly, in Burlington, Iowa, on "The Crime of Poverty," said:

> The dangerous man is not the man who tries to excite discontent; the dangerous man is the man who says all is as it ought to be. Such a state of things cannot continue; such tendencies as we see at work here cannot go on without bringing at least an overwhelming crash.

Well did the contemporary Duke of Argyle dub him the "Prophet of San Francisco."

Governor Curley is "alleged" to have said that Lord Philip Snowden had acquiesced in the tariffs imposed by the National Government. He is grossly deceived. Snowden, who wrote an eloquent foreword to George's "Protection or Free Trade," published with his other works by the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, is not the man to deny the susceptibility of a practical application of real free trade. Of the government's policy he said:

> I consider the protective tariff to be an excise tax on the wages of labor. I shall never become a party to any such procedure,

so he resigned a distinguished post in parliament and retired to private life. In a pamphlet just issued he examines the New Deal of Lloyd George and says every one of his schemes will call for the acquisition of land by the state and local authorities. Out of 200 million pounds a year to be spent on public works, he estimates that landlords will reap from 30 to 50 million pounds, and calls the attention of the voters to the fact that when land is needed for ameliorative plans the "community is bled white." This unpleasant reminder of the local situation makes us reflect that this one "touch" of human nature has the whole world skinned. "Making work" for a few hundred men by building at Tyneside a deep water quay, gets this comment from a London editor:

> New quays, better facilities, higher tariffs, these are the features of the European and world madhouse, which this country has entered as one of its more deluded inmates.

This applies as well to the mooted free port of Boston, the wharves of which, unless we adopt scientific methods of supporting the government, will be festooned with undisturbed masses of seaweed. Important if true, is the report that the young king of Belgium has turned toward free trade. If this little industrial nation has the courage to adopt it perhaps some of the big fellows will pluck up a spirit of adventure. Many whose only desire is to return to the status quo are asking, belligerently, where the money is coming from to pay for all the government schemes for making work! In 1929 the ground rent was estimated at over 13 billion dollars per year; labor and industry had to pay that for permission to use the earth. After that the government required all sorts of taxation for its support. Every move it is now making to furnish work is reviving and increasing the price of land—shall speculators be enriched again, or shall the community rent be taxed into the public treasury? WINIFRED B. COSSETTE.

Cambridge, Mass.

The World and the Churches

Editor of UNITY:

Recently the Pope issued a call to the churches for three days of prayer to God "to illuminate the minds

of those who have in their hands the government and fate of peoples."

A few years ago those same churches were praying to their national gods to give them the victory over their enemies. And now when the different governments are compelling them to do the things they have upheld in the state they are rebelling.

Some ten or more years ago General Bliss said, "The responsibility of another war is entirely upon the professing Christians of the United States." Bishop Francis J. McConnell said, "A distinguished general of the allied forces in the world war once urged me to preach the old-fashioned gospel of the inner life, because he said it makes men fight harder—and die more willingly."

Is not the modern world the logical outcome of the teaching of the church? Does not the fundamental beliefs of the church lead to and encourage war?

In trying to discover the answer we must keep certain fundamental facts in mind. We teach more by what we practice than by what we preach. We become like what we worship. Our actual belief in the nature and purpose of the creator of the universe is the ultimate base of conduct.

The late Samuel Zane Batten said, "The most potent forces in life are indirect; the influences that mold life are mainly unconscious. The psychic factors of life, as ideals and sentiments, traditions and customs, are the factors that color thought and determine volition. The psychic factors of imitation and sympathy form the chief factor in man's spiritual development and the prime condition of all collective life.

"The institutions of the state are the organized expression of the people's religion. The politics of a nation are its interpretation of the Golden Rule. Politics is the art of applied religion."

We must also remember there are but two roads for humanity to travel. They do not run parallel but in opposite directions. One leads to life, the other to death. Then when the fundamental beliefs of the church are the direct opposite of what Christ taught there can be no question as to where they lead.

"There is a way that seems right unto man but the end thereof is death."

The tragedy of the age is that man is dying for love and sympathy, and yet the greatest exhibition of love that man has ever seen or will see, he refuses as yet to accept.

He still doubts,

"The inexhaustible and infinite capacity of Godhead to forgive."

JOHN T. RICKETT.

Howell, Mich.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 122)

man of about fifty, spoke up. "I'm a farm hand," he said. "I get fifty cents a day when I can get work, but I can't get no work. My best year was in 1929, when I made a share crop. I came out owing only $5.00."

"Is that all you came out owing?" said Moskop. "That was in the good times."

"Next time I came out owing $85.00," said Pickering. "The crooked pencil was going good."

The tenant usually receives three-fourths of the crop, they explained, if he furnishes tools, seed, mules and his own provision. If he has nothing, and this is the situation of most of them, he receives half. At least that is the theory. Actually, this proportion is seriously disturbed by the "crooked pencil." During the working season the cropper is cared for by the plantation store. Ten per cent interest is charged against him at the time of the purchase, and another ten per cent at the time of settlement. The crooked pencil gets in its work through the fact that the owner keeps the only books. Tenants are forced to trade at these stores.

The Tenant Farmers' Union has as a part of its program the elimination of this indispensable lever to debt peonage.

Another thing the union insists shall go is the present illegal evictions. Erskine Caldwell describes a case. It happened in Georgia, but is typical of what R. G. Tugwell calls "bootleg slavery" anywhere in the cotton country today. "In 1934 a tenant farmer in Jefferson county was unable, because of old age and illness, to work his crop. A physician prescribed for his ailment, but the man could not buy the medicine, and no relief agency would supply it. A four-year old girl in the family died at the end of the year of anemia. The tenant moved several miles away to another farm, but after several weeks the landlord decided that he was too old and ill to work a crop on a tenant-farmer basis, or any other basis, and he was evicted.

"The household goods were carried to the land limits and deposited by the side of the road. Another tenant took the goods under shelter, and the landowner gave notice that if they were not removed from his land, he would come into the house and burn them.

"In the meantime the old man had gone off into the swamp without axe, hammer, or saw, with the intention of felling trees and building a log house for his family. He has not been heard from since. . . ."

"That's what hundreds of us are up against in Arkansas," said Sharecropper Moskop in New York. "Hundreds of families have been evicted by the plantation owners. They're just living alongside the road. I took two families in to live with me in my two-room shack."

Over 7,000 letters have come in to the AAA on account of these evictions, and 7,000 is a lot of letters to get from people to whom letter-writing is the last resort of desperation. When the AAA got them, it knew something was up and sent Mrs. Mary Connor Myers, Boston lawyer, to Arkansas to investigate. Her report has so far been suppressed. The Tenant Farmers' Union demand its publication. She found, according to the United Press, "contract violations which caused cruel hardships . . . sharecroppers straggling along the highways, homeless and unable to obtain relief."

Two leaders of the sharecroppers are former ministers. Both have lost their positions in churches, have been arrested and jailed. Claude C. Williams was recently arrested for leading a strike of FERA relief workers near Fort Smith. Ward H. Rodgers, a member of the executive committee of the Tenant Union, is twenty-four, a graduate of Vanderbilt and Boston, and a member of the F. O. R. He was accused of "anarchy" because he believes that Negroes and whites must organize and stand together in their struggle for economic justice. Convicted in lower court, his case has been appealed by C. T. Carpenter, of Marked Tree, attorney for the union. Carpenter has also filed an injunction suit in Federal Court against con-

tinued interference with the meetings of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. Organizers attempting to hold meetings in the eastern part of the state have been driven from town to town. Powers Hapgood, well known Socialist, and Howard Kester, former F. O. R. secretary, were seized by a Ku Klux Klan mob and escorted out of Mississippi County. Protests to Governor J. M. Futrell have had no effect.

But Rodgers and Williams are not typical of the ministry generally in Arkansas. Most of them do not know what is happening. With a few shining exceptions even the few "liberals" are carefully concerning themselves with less troublesome matters. A colored preacher is openly campaigning among his people denying that conditions are bad and urging them to avoid the union. Most of his congregation has deserted him, but his resources miraculously continue undiminished. The planters are paying him, people say. When the minister of the leading Protestant church of Marked Tree said that the union's charges of wholesale evictions and starvation were untrue, he was given the names of a dozen suffering families within two blocks of his own church.

Now this minister, J. Abner Sage, has been made executive secretary of the Marked Tree Cooperative Association, a "company union" sponsored by the planters. Its purpose, of course, is to break the Southern Tenant Farmer's Union. This it is trying to do by circulating false statements concerning the Union, by confusing the issues involved, by raising a large sum of money for the prosecution of Ward Rodgers and Lucian Koch and by doling out relief where it will hurt the Union most. The Union is fully alive to the situation. In a statement issued on March 6th, it denounced the Association, and said, "We are many thousands strong and growing stronger every day. Though every upward step has been ruthlessly fought by the planters our members have not wavered. We have committed no acts of violence in any way whatsoever, but our leaders and members have been beaten, mobbed, jailed and driven from the land and their homes by the landlords and planters. Our Union has the will and the courage to break down and destroy the plantation system which has enslaved us for so many weary years. The members of the Southern Tenant Farmer's Union, as is well known, are all American citizens and are fighting for their rights as such, which include life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for themselves and their families as fought for and won by our forefathers. These rights are being denied us today. The yoke which has been placed about our necks is no longer bearable. We shall seek our rights by peaceful and lawful means. We invite all other organizations of farmers and workers to unite with us in our struggles."

Money is needed for the Ward Rodgers Defense Fund, clothing is needed to clothe sharecropping families, help is needed to buy food for thousands of evicted men, women and children who are suffering now. Their only hope lies in the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union winning its fight. Contributions should be sent to the Ward Rodgers Defense Fund, 112 East 19th St., New York City.

—*Fellowship.*

THE ARBITRATOR

For sixteen years this petite peppery paper has offended some of its readers each month by its truthful exposition of the news. It has no axe to grind; it is not dull. It is for the under-dog and snappy.

The editor has written "The Mistakes of Jesus" to demonstrate the improvement in ethical, social and religious standards since the first century. Price $1, to include a year's subscription to The Arbitrator which is 60 cents.

114 East 31st St., New York City

Unity-Forward March

Special offer now running of $2.00 a year to new and old subscribers will expire July 1st next.

To be found in coming issues:

Articles by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Brent Dow Allinson, James H. Cousins of India, Stephen S. Wise, Robert Whitaker, Dorothy Walton Binder and other equally outstanding writers. Also editorial comment on world affairs and reviews of outstanding books by competent critics.

UNITY is an excellent gift for friends, students, libraries, etc.

To Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Enclosed you will find check for $2.00 for which please enter / renew / extend my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Name .....

Address .....

The April-May Issue of

The New Humanist

contains

MAX C. OTTO
"John Dewey's 'Common Faith'"

UNEMPLOYABILITY—A MEDICAL PROBLEM
Bernard Fantus

INTELLECTUALS UNDER FASCISM
C. Drevet

REGIMENTATION AND LIBERTY IN AMERICA
Robert Weston

ERASMUS INTERROGATES FATHER COUGHLIN
Harold P. Marley

SPRING NOCTURNE—A POEM
Mildred Hardcrest

HEBREW HISTORY SECULARIZED
F. H. Hankins

ARE WE SPIRITUALLY BANKRUPT?
Max Kaufman

THE GROUNDS OF GOOD GOVERNMENT
L. M. Pape

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books, postpaid: HUMANIST SERMONS, edited by C. W. Reese; HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 *Per Copy* 25c
Canadian & Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION

330 South Dearborn Street, Chicago